

REMARKS

Claims 7 and 9-11 remain pending in the present application. No claims have been amended.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 7, 9, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) alleging them to be unpatentable over Meyer (U.S. Patent No. 3,355,611) in view of Nakazawa (JP 06155268). The Examiner alleges that this combination would render Applicants' invention obvious to those skilled in the art.

Applicants' Claim 7, among other elements, defines providing a grinding wheel or cutting wheel, positioning the grinding wheel or cutting wheel at a desired angle with respect to the axis, determining a depth of the cut of the grinding wheel or cutting wheel, plunging the grinding wheel or cutting wheel into the top surface, and forming an arcuate spring retention plug in the top surface in a plane transverse to the axis to have a slope relative to the axis.


The Examiner alleges that the combination of Meyer et al. and Nakazawa would render Applicants' invention obvious to those skilled in the art. Applicants draw the Examiner's attention to column 2, lines 28-36 of Meyer et al. where they define that the groove 12 has an interlocking connection with the clip 22. The interlocking connection is made by an interference fit such as a dovetail or an undercut. Thus, the groove in the Meyer et al. reference must have sides which angle away from the top surface opening. Accordingly, the bottom of the groove has a larger width than the opening at the top of the groove. This provides the interference fit to retain the clip within the groove.

By utilizing a wheel, as illustrated by Nakazawa, the groove would end up as an arcuate groove as illustrated in 5a and 5b. This arcuate groove has a bottom width smaller than the width at the opening at the top of the groove. Accordingly, the groove does not provide an interference fit and the sides would retain a clip. Accordingly, one would not utilize the arcuate groove of Nakazawa to combine it with Meyer et al. To do so would render Meyer et al. inoperative since the clip would not include an interference fit and thus would not attach to the brush.

Thus, Nakazawa, by providing an arcuate groove with the bottom smaller than the top opening, would teach away from the Meyer et al. reference. Accordingly, this combination would not render Applicants' invention obvious to those skilled in the art.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass the case to issue at his earliest possible convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, he should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,



W.R. Duke Taylor
Reg. No. 31,306

Mark D. Elchuk
Reg. No. 33,686
Attorney for Applicants

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303
(248) 641-1600

Date: July 18, 2006
Attorney Docket No. 0275Y-000583/NPC